

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TERRY R. COCHRANE,)	3:11-cv-00092-LRH (WGC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTE ORDER</u>
)	January 10, 2013
vs.)	
)	
LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN)	
POLICE DEPARTMENT, et. al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court are Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Doc. # 119) and Emergency Motion for Extension of Copywork (Doc. # 120).

Plaintiff seeks an extension of time in the amount of thirty days to file his reply in response to Defendants' opposition to his Motion to hold Thomas D. Dillard in Contempt. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an extension of his copywork limit so that he may attach evidence to this reply and in the event he has to file an appeal. The court will address the copywork motion (Doc. # 120) first.

An inmate plaintiff does not have a right to free photocopying. *Johnson v. Moore*, 948 F.2d 517, 521 (9th Cir. 1991); *Sands v. Lewis*, 886 F.2d 1166, 1169 (9th Cir. 1989) ("numerous courts have rejected any constitutional right to free and unlimited photocopying"). Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) Administrative Regulation (AR) 722 governs copying of legal documents by inmates, and provides, "[c]opies of legal documents requested by inmates may be made for a nominal fee." AR 722.01(9), available at <http://www.doc.nv.gov/?q=node/68>. "Inmates can only accrue a maximum of \$100 debt for copy work expenses for all cases, not per case." *Id.*

///

MINUTES OF THE COURT

3:11-cv-00092-LRH-WGC

Date: January 10, 2013

Page 2

A court may order a prison to provide additional photocopying when the prisoner demonstrates that an increase is necessary for an inmate to provide copies to the court and other parties. *See, e.g., Allen v. Clark County Detention Center*, 2011 WL 886343, at * 2 (D. Nev. March 11, 2011).

The court will **GRANT** Plaintiff's request for an extension of the copywork limit, but such request is limited to **\$10.00 TO BE USED IN THIS CASE ONLY**. If Plaintiff needs additional extensions in order to file an appeal, he must seek such relief from the appellate court.

Now, the court will address Plaintiff's motion for extension of time to file his reply brief. (Doc. # 119.) Plaintiff filed the underlying motion to hold Defendants' attorney, Thomas Dillard, in contempt on November 28, 2012. (Doc. # 114.) Defendants filed their response on December 17, 2012. (Doc. # 116.) Pursuant to the local rules, any reply brief is to be filed and served seven days after service of a responsive brief. L.R. 7-2(c). Therefore, Plaintiff's reply brief should have been filed and served on or before December 24, 2012. Instead, Plaintiff waited until January 9, 2013, to file the instant motion for an extension of time.

The court will allow Plaintiff a brief extension of time within which to file his reply brief; however, he is reminded that future filings that do not comply with the rules of this district will not be considered. Plaintiff shall have up to and including **January 24, 2013** to file and serve his reply brief. **THERE WILL BE NO FURTHER EXTENSIONS.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/
Deputy Clerk